

## REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on June 23, 2004. Claim 6 is pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxemchuk (U.S. 6,219,346), hereinafter Maxemchuk, in view of Buhrmann (U.S. 5,903,845), hereinafter Buhrmann.

Applicant has again carefully studied the reference of Maxemchuk, and the reference of Buhrmann, and has carefully reviewed the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. In response to the 112 rejection the applicant has amended claim 6 to overcome the rejection.

Regarding the rejection under 103(a) the applicant has now amended claim 6 somewhat further, and investigated the reference of Buhrmann relative to the limitation in applicant's claim that the routing rules are edited by the client using the communicator unit itself. In the Buhrmann reference another device, such as a PC is used to provide and perhaps to update the user profile. The device must be a PIM device as taught and defined in the teaching of Buhrmann.

As detailed below by applicant, the claim as amended clearly and unarguably distinguishes applicant's invention over that of the combined art of Maxemchuk/Buhrmann.


As the single claim as argued above is clearly shown to be patentable over the prior art either singly or in combination, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn, and that the case be passed quickly to issue.

If any fees are due beyond fees paid with this amendment, authorization is made to deduct those fees from deposit account 50-0534. If any time extension is

needed beyond any extension requested with this amendment, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dan Kikinis

by 

Donald R. Boys

Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys  
Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457